ADDRESS

OF THE

New York State Republican Reform League

FOLLOWED BY

THE THIRD-TERM QUESTION

BY

Hon. MATTHEW HALE

AND

THE REPUBLIC AND THE PRESIDENCY

BY

Honorable A. N. COLE

Reprinted from the NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
for April, 1880

NEW YORK
THOMPSON & MOREAU, PRINTERS, 51 & 53 MAIDEN LANE
1880

ADDRESS.

New York State Republican Reform League.

HEADQUARTERS, 34 PARK ROW, NEW YORK CITY,

May 20th, 1880.

Recent events, the particulars of which need not be entered upon, having to some degree engendered in the public mind an impression that the organization known as the New York State Republican Reform League has other objects in view, than the upbuilding, strengthening and perpetuation of the Republican party, there would seem to be occasion for a full and free declaration on the part of its more immediate representatives, covering, so far as may be, the entire case.

Under these circumstances, the subscribers, constituting the Executive Committee of the League, beg leave to say, that a knowledge of the causes combining to bring the organization into being, the elements composing it, together with the history of its rise, growth and development, are essential to an intelligent understanding of its work, aims and ultimate objects. This will necessitate the going back to the period of the inauguration of Ulysses S. Grant as President on the 4th of March, 1869. It is something well known to most people, that large numbers of those earliest engaged in bringing into being the Republican party, doubted the wisdom of making General Grant candidate for the Presidency at all. To these, the camp, the field and the schools of war were not regarded as the best and most wholesome educators for governors of a free people; and, while all Republicans and thousands of patriotic Democrats admired, honored and respected General Grant, they looked nevertheless upon Salmon P. Chase, Charles Sumner, William M. Evarts, and scores, not to say hundreds, of others, trained in civil affairs, as better fitted than he for the Chief Magistracy

of the Republic. But General Grant was the hero of the hour, and it was impossible at the time to stem the tide in his favor. He was accordingly nominated and elected, receiving the united support of all classes of Republicans.

At the period of his inauguration, the party was united, determined and strong. But divisions soon arose, bitter feuds were engendered, and factions took the place of peace and union. Scarcely had General Grant been six months President when, from causes never explained or understood, there was begun a war upon certain chiefs in the party, having no parallel in the history of American politics. The inauguration of changes in nearly all departments of the customs, postal and other branches of the service then took place, until scarcely a friend of Greeley, Chase and Fenton was found in office at the close of General Grant's first year as President. That discontent, dissatisfaction and disgust followed on the part of a large portion of the party, was natural. The wise and prudent policies of war, which had enabled the eminent soldier to surround himself with the best military talent of the nation, seemed to have deserted him when placed at the head of civil affairs. His chief counsellors were taken from the ranks of those who had most axes to grind, and, in their grinding, manifestly cared more for their own political fortunes and fame, than for those of their party and country. That such a policy resulted in alienating large numbers from the party, need not be wondered at. The entire patronage of the Government was bestowed with a view to building up one class of leaders, and the pulling down of another. So marked was this policy, and to such an extent was it carried, that one man, Senator Roscoe Conkling, was made substantially dictator in all things pertaining to the distribution of patronage.

The scenes witnessed during the organization of the Legislature at Albany, on the incoming of the Presidential year of 1872, can hardly be described. Suffice it to say, that what was believed to be a majority of upwards of twenty, on the part of the Greeley-Fentonians, was, through the presence at the State capital, on the first day of the new year, of nearly or quite all

of the principal federal office-holders in the State, transformed into a minority. In briefly reviewing the political features of the juncture to which we refer, mention should not fail to be made of the steady encroachment on the part of the office-holding elements of the party, throughout the State. Local and general committees were created by machinery, who arrogated to themselves powers, and assumed authority at variance with popular rights within the party. All there was left of the grand old Republican party of 1856, '60, '64, and '68, and of its millions of voters, had been transformed into a political machine, cunningly devised to advance the fortunes of individuals.

That the memorable revolt of 1872—resulting in the nomination of Horace Greeley for President—followed, was not only natural, but inevitable. That upwards of fifty thousand life-long and earnest Republicans in this State alone joined in that revolt, is a fact well known to those into whose hands came the rosters by counties, towns, school and election districts throughout the State. Five thousand in New York, with an equal number in Kings, two thousand in St. Lawrence, eighteen hundred in Chautauqua, fifteen hundred in Allegany, and so on relatively all over the State made up an aggregate, as already stated, of more than fifty thousand. Despite all, this formidable revolt failed on account of desertion from the ranks of Democratic allies. Greeley was defeated, and, for the time being, his friends were apparently discomfited. This, however, was only seeming. The succeeding year found three or four hundred Liberals assembled in State Convention at Elmira, Republicans still, and yet, barely a majority in favor of making up the eclectic ticket, composed of Republicans and Democrats, that year elected. From that time until the close of the campaign of the year 1874, when Samuel J. Tilden was elected Governor, defeating John A. Dix by a majority of fifty thousand, the doors had been shut by the Republican machine in the face of the malcontents, and due notice was given that, as regarded any grace, beyond the privilege of voting the Republican ticket when made by the machine, no liberal need apply. Nor were the en-

gineers of the machine, as a rule, in any measure convinced that it was either desirable or essential to the future of the Republican party, that the alienated and estranged Independents should further act with it. This was the trial hour for the Republican party in this State. Had the entire Liberal and Independent element then gone over to Tilden, there would have been no hope of recovery. Even as it was, fully two-thirds did so at that one election. This, however, pretty much ended the Liberal and Democratic alliance. During the succeeding year, 1875, fully thirty-five thousand of the fifty thousand Liberals took their place again in the ranks of the Republican party. It was during this latter year that work was renewed, and actively forwarded, entailing sacrifices of time and money, and resulting in the formation of the New York State Auxiliary of the National Reform League. The national organization was simply inchoate in character in most of the States; however, such was its influence that it made itself felt at the Fifth Avenue Conference, held in the city of New York in the early spring of the succeeding Presidential year, as a most important factor in that gathering, influencing action not only at Cincinnati, but also up to the present time.

It was during the Presidential campaign of 1876, that the League, organized on the plan of a State Committee of one hundred members, one for each county and forty at large, an Executive Committee of twenty-five members, a correspondent in each town of the State, with associates by school districts, and one in each ward of cities with associates by election districts, and well organized in nearly all of the counties with the exception of about ten, counting those of New York, Kings and Erie, and having imperfect organization there also, did a most important work, by bringing into harmonious action and accord the disaffected or anti-machine elements of the party, and embracing within its correspondence, association and membership, tens of thousands of the very best men of the State.

On the committee of this State's Auxiliary were found the names of the following Republicans, not unknown to the people of our State: Gen. Alexander S. Diven, Chairman

of State Committee; Hon. Bradford R. Wood, Hon. Lemon Thompson, and Dr. John Swinburne, of Albany; Dr. Nathan V. Hull, of Allegany; Hon. Orlow W. Chapman and Mr. James H. Armstrong, of Broome; Hon. T. M. Pomeroy, of Cayuga; Hon. W. L. Sessions and Hon. Henry C. Lake, of Chautauqua; Hon. Norman M. Allen, of Cattaraugus; Hon. Horatio Ballard, of Cortland; Hon. Norwood Bowne, of Delaware; Hon. Abiah W. Palmer and Hon. H. G. Eastman, of Dutchess; Hon. John T. Hogeboom, of Columbia; Hon. Monroe Hall, of Essex; Hon. Wells S. Dickinson, of Franklin; Mr. C. B. Thomson, of Genesee; Captain C.W. Godard, A. N. Cole and Dr. S. S. Guy, and others, of Kings; Hon. William M. White, of Livingston; Hon. William N. Emerson and Charles E. Fitch, Esq., of Monroe; Hon. Ezra Graves, of Herkimer; W. T. Manchester, Esq., of Madison; Hon. Dan. H. Cole, of Orleans; Chancellor E. O. Haven, Silas Smith and James Geddes, of Onondaga: Hon. George B. Sloane and Hon De Witt C. Littlejohn, of Oswego; Hon. L. Bradford Prince, of Queens; Hon. Geo. F. Carman, of Suffolk; Hon. S. T. Hayt, of Steuben; Hon. Hobart Krum, of Schoharie; Hon. Robert Loughran, of Ulster; Charles St. John, Jr., of Orange; Gen. E. A. Merritt and Hon. A. B. James, of St. Lawrence; Hon. Beman Brockway, of Jefferson; Hon. Amos V. Smiley, of Lewis; S. C. Cleveland, Esq., of Yates; Gerrit Smith, Jr., of Ontario; Gen. Lloyd Aspinwall, General John Cochrane, Elwood E. Thorne, Hon. Thomas E. Stewart, Hon. Benjamin F. Manierre, Hon. Henry G. Stebbins, Hon. James R. Angel and others, of the City and County of New York; Gen. James W. Husted and Dr. Henry Randall Waite, of Westchester, and several others, one hundred in all. Its Executive Committee, consisting of twenty-five members, was made up from the above list.

At the close of the campaign, the books and records of the League were left in possession of the chairman of its Executive Committee, by whom they have been held as custodian. In the meantime, at a meeting of the State Committee, held at the St. Nicholas Hotel in the city of New York, in the month of December, 1876, and largely attended,

a resolution was passed empowering the Chairman and Secretary of the Executive Committee to take such action, from time to time, as might be found necessary to continue the work of the League; and thus it was that, from the close of the campaign of 1876 to the opening of the Presidential year of 1880, the correspondence and work of the organization were kept up and continued almost wholly by the Chairman of its Executive Committee.

Head-quarters again being opened the first week in January of the present year, the work of reorganization was begun by dropping the name and form of a national league, and adopting that of the New York State Republican Reform League; a majority of the members of its Executive, and a considerable portion of the State Committee, continuing to act. In response to letters, circulars and documents sent out during the first six weeks of the year, came assurances from all portions of the State, that the correspondents of the New York State Auxiliary of the National Reform League were generally inclined to act as correspondents of the organization now existing. The organization thus becoming a league of correspondents and associates, put on, in its new life, the form of unity, nor has its Executive Committee taken any action, nor will it do so, not clearly authorized by the sentiment and concurrence of such correspondents and associates. The following platform, or declaration of purposes, is the foundation of the League:

SUFFRAGE.

I. The persistent use of the best means for securing an honest and free exercise of the right of suffrage, to the end that every lawful vote may be cast without interference, discrimination or intimidation, and when cast shall be counted, believing that in the sacred guardianship of the ballot box is found the only guarantees of a good and permanent government.

PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS.

II. The adoption of such measures in the conduct of primary elections as shall free them from improper influences, and shall best secure the unprejudiced expression of the popular will, and

the best attainable choice of candidates for office, thereby preventing the machinery of party politics from becoming the enginery of corruption, and securing the nomination and election to office of capable, honest and incorruptible men.

CIVIL SERVICE.

III. The application to the conduct of the civil service of those business principles which shall secure therein stability, efficiency, honesty and economy; opposition to any use of official power or patronage for private or party purposes, and the enforcement of the reasonable demand that holders, by appointment, of official positions, national, State, or local, shall not to the neglect of their proper official duties hold offices in political party organizations or in nominating conventions.

THE JUDICIARY, THE LEGISLATIVE AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

IV. The adoption of such measures as may be necessary in order to preserve the purity of the Judiciary; guard against the demoralizing effects of special and class legislation; and secure the integrity of our common school system.

FEDERAL AUTHORITY IN THE STATES.

V. The protection of all citizens in the free exercise of their constitutional rights, by the exercise of Federal power if necessary; sustaining firmly national supremacy in national matters.

THE NATIONAL CREDIT.

VI. A firm adherence to the use of such measures as shall secure and maintain the highest public credit at home and abroad, honest money, and an honest dollar for all alike, and the refunding of the national debt into bonds bearing the lowest rate of interest attainable.

HOME INDUSTRIES AND FOREIGN COMMERCE.

VII. The adoption of such a policy in the Customs Revenue as shall properly protect the home industries whose development is of national importance, while encouraging in other respects unrestricted commerce.

THE PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

VIII. An amendment to the Federal Constitution providing either for a longer single Presidential term, or the intermission of at least one term before a President shall be eligible for reëlection.

NATIONAL POLICY IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS.

IX. The pursuit by the Government of a wise and just internal policy, which shall allay the bitterness of a struggle long since ended in an honorable peace; respect the privileges of every citizen; advance the best interests of all the States; and cement the Union preserved in war, by kindling a spirit of patriotism which shall bind together the people of the whole land without regard to class, color, or geographical lines.

A careful study of this platform will make it manifest that a single and longer term of the Presidency, or two terms, as now provided, of four years each, a term intervening before reëlection, is a cardinal doctrine of the League. This provision is suggested from the fact, that the greatest abuses of power thus far exercised by individuals or parties, have come through the use and abuse of patronage on the part of an Executive in office. So alarming have become these encroachments, through the agencies of conclave and committee, as to largely, if not wholly, defy and defeat the will of the people. Though the Republican Reform League then, has not been conducted, and will not be, as an anti-third-term or anti-Grant organization, its correspondence, nevertheless, coming from every section of the State, indicates a condition of things convincing any one who examines it, that to nominate General Grant, or any one else for a third term of the Presidency, would prove a most hazardous experiment. That it is impossible to carry New York for a third-term candidate, this correspondence completely demonstrates. The tone of public sentiment, as reflected in the press, and heard all over the land, makes it equally manifest that to renominate Grant would be simply to court defeat. His nomination, in fact, is only possible under the operation of the unit rule, enforced on the part, not of the State Conventions adopting it, since these have

adjourned, but on the part of the National Convention itself.

The operation of instructions, and enforcement of the unit rule, is a manifest usurpation of power on the part of conclave, caucus and committee, calculated to incite all free men to rise in revolt against it. Did no other abuse than this exist in the methods of parties, the overthrow and abrogation of this irrational and despotic exercise of political power on the part of an artificially, if not fraudulently, constructed majority, would call for the organization of the League. Neither in Pennsylvania, where the unit rule was adopted in State Convention, nor in New York, where instructions were given to the delegation to vote as a body for Grant, was there found an absence of causes, vitiating such proceedings. A considerable number of the delegates to Harrisburgh were chosen by local committees, while at Utica, entire delegations, chosen by frauds of the most flagrant character, were admitted, while others entitled to seats were rejected. An honestly constituted convention, either at Harrisburg or Utica, would never have voted instructions or adopted the unit rule. Several eminent members of the League hold seats on the delegation to Chicago, and these will gravely offend against its most cardinal doctrine, that of the exercise of personal independence and political obligation to respect the will of immediate constituencies, should they fail at the very outset at Chicago, to vote in favor of the principle more elaborately brought out in an article which appeared under the head of The Republic and the Presidency, in the April number of the *National Quarterly Review*. This article, as well as another on The Third-Term Question, by the Hon. Matthew Hale, also found in the Review, in a large degree reflects the sentiments of a majority of the correspondents and associates of the League. Upon one point more especially, we speak in conclusion. No one is, has been, or will be, authorized to speak for the Republican Reform League on the question of candidates. The League has no candidate, or candidates, nor will it have any. It is entirely devoted to the one end, of begetting a system of nominations which will faithfully reflect the popular will. Its correspondence

developes the fact that there are more Republicans in New York State in favor of the nomination of James G. Blaine than of any one whose name has been mentioned in connection with the Presidency. It developes equally the fact, that John Sherman is very strong, and General Grant weak in New York, and leads to the conclusion that this sentiment, divided in its popular, political and business influences, is likely to find itself correspondingly reflected at Chicago. It is the crystallization and faithful reflection of this sentiment on the part of the Republican masses, that the League would have respected and enforced. It hopes, during the next four years, to see realized a degree of progress, providing for the assembling at all polling places in the American Union, early in the Presidential year, on the same day, under provisions and protection of law, all citizens, each for himself declaring whom he prefers as his candidate for President. Urging the adoption of these principles, and insisting upon their just and equal application, the League has no fellowship or toleration for the vagaries of that order of political doctrinaires, who set themselves up as better judges of the fitness and qualification of a candidate for the Presidency, than are forty-nine-fiftieths of the Republican party.

In the pursuit of its work, it neither has done nor will do aught to beget rivalries among the leaders, or create division or strife within the party, but it will insist upon the equal right of all Republicans to recognition and representation in primary, caucus and convention proceedings. The single fact—shameful and mortifying to the extremest degree,—that, of the sixty thousand Republicans in the city of New York, less than ten thousand of their names are found upon the association books of the so-called Republican party, stamps the impress of fraud upon the primary proceedings of a locality determining the recent outcome at Utica, and begetting the rapidly developing revolt impending at Chicago. It is not surprising that a full score of delegates in New York State have, as we are informed, already made up their minds to respect the clearly expressed will of their immediate constituencies, and vote for emancipation from the thrall and fetters of conclave and com-

mittee, begetting unit rules and instructions—sought to arbitrarily bind the delegate to dishonor his own convictions and defy the will of his immediate constituency.

The spirit thus cropping out is to bring to the front a class of leaders comparatively unknown to the past of American politics; and among them all, no one seems more eminent than the great commoner, James G. Blaine. In thus concluding, it may not be inappropriate to add, that, while a majority of this committee would prefer Secretary John Sherman for President, they would prove false to their professions of respect for the popular will, were they to attempt to cover up the fact, that Senator Blaine would seem, at the present, to be the choice of the masses of the party.

That this feeling is the outgrowth of impulse, combined with an intelligent appreciation of services rendered to the people in a lifetime of work for their welfare, is probable. The value of the services of Secretary Sherman, however, more slowly appreciated, cannot fail to place him where, in a little while longer, no living American will have earned a more solid, deserved and permanent popularity. As it looks now, it cannot be long before a realization of the value of Secretary Sherman's services will acquire an universality coming nearer to making him President by the common acclaim of the people, than anything realized during the last half century. This committee gives no opinion as to the relative strength of Blaine or Sherman as candidates for the suffrages of the people; but it does not hesitate to state, that the correspondence of the League demonstrates the fact that, failure to nominate one or the other of those statesmen at Chicago, would disappoint the hopes and expectations of fully three-fourths of the Republicans of New York. This committee is convinced that either Secretary Sherman or Senator Blaine would poll the entire Republican vote and carry the State. Whether any new man, or "dark horse," so termed, could do this is a matter of doubt, to say the least. In one regard, the League Platform will not be found changing. While it will yield obedience to the exigencies of war, or to any menace to the peace or safety of the

nation, and agrees with the sentiment so aptly illustrated by Lincoln, that it is not a good time or place to swap horses while crossing the stream,—it will equally hold to the one-term principle as a rule which must govern the future of this Republic. That the one-term principle will ultimately prevail, and that the Constitution will be correspondingly amended, is but a question of time. Until then, antecedent as well as existing conditions should be made use of, leaving to the intelligence of the people the enforcement of that unwritten law, more sacred than statutes, covenants or constitutions, which forbids an election for more than two terms, of any one man to the Presidency. What the people would have, the League would have also; applying this principle not merely to the Presidency, but equally to all nominations for elective offices.

Convinced that the time has come for revolt, if need be, against a most despotic and degrading phase of political tyranny, that of caucus, conclave and committee, as developed through the machine, the League will know no truce or suspension of warfare, until unit rules are everywhere abrogated; and instructions, other than such as are merely suggestive, as well as all other forms of tyranny, begotten by King Caucus, shall find burial in the grave of the dead past, nor, as ghosts of the dark ages stalking forth in the daylight of the nineteenth century—survivors of feudalism and relics of barbarism—defy reason in morals, and decency in politics.

Nor need any one doubt either the present power, or final triumph of the League. It has served the purposes of certain classes of men to decry, belittle and seem to scorn it, and one of the daily journals of New York City has lent the influence of its columns to this end. The name of the paper need not be given, but suffice it to say that it is not the New York *Tribune*. It has seemed cunning also, not to say wise, by sapping, mining, fraud and deceit, to seek to turn aside the work of the League—aiming solely to upbuild, strengthen and perpetuate the Republican party, laying deep its foundations in the heart and conscience of the people—

and to transform it into a new machine, to further the ends and advance the fortunes of individuals.

All this has signally failed. The League goes on with its work, aiming to secure to the people a government of the people, by the people, for the people. And so shall the harvest be.

JOHN SWINBURNE, Albany.
LEMON THOMPSON, Albany.
A. N. COLE, Allegany.
T. L. MINIER, Chemung.
C. W. GODARD, Kings.
E. P. CONE, Kings.
JOSEPH REEVE, Kings.
W. M. WHITE, Livingston.
APPLETON MORGAN, New York.
J. H. TUCKER, New York.
WM. LINDSAY, New York.
NAPOLEON THOMPSON, New York.
ROMYN HITCHCOCK, New York.
GEO. F. CARMAN, Suffolk.
ROBERT LOUGHRAN, Ulster.

A. N. Cole, *Chairman.*
E. P. Cone, *Secretary.*

Reprinted from the NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW,
for April, 1880.—Copyright.

THE THIRD-TERM QUESTION.

The Constitution of the United States was ratified by the State of New York at a convention held at Poughkeepsie, the 26th day of July, 1788. That convention was presided over by George Clinton, the first governor of the State. Among its most distinguished members were Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, Robert R. Livingston, James Clinton and Melancthon Smith.

There had been a sharp conflict in that convention as to whether the ratification should be absolute or conditional. A large majority of the delegates were, at first, in favor of only a conditional ratification, dependent upon the adoption of certain amendments proposed. Finally, however, news having come of the assent of New Hampshire, and only one State more being necessary to the adoption of the Constitution, it was decided to make the ratification unqualified; but the resolution adopted stated that the Constitution was ratified by New York, in full confidence that the proposed amendments would be adopted. Among the amendments proposed by the State of New York was the following: "*That no person shall be eligible to the office of President of the United States a third time.*"*

Opposition to a third term, then, is not a new thing in the State of New York. This amendment was never formally incorporated into the Constitution, but the principle embodied in it has ever since been acted upon. Up to this time, no person has been elected or voted for, for a third term, as President of the United States.

A brief statement will present the historical facts bearing upon this subject:

Washington was twice elected, but peremptorily refused

* J. J. Elliott' *Debates*, Vol. I, p. 305.

the use of his name as a candidate for a third term. It has been argued, by the recent advocates of third-termism, that his declension was not from any conviction of duty or regard to public interest, but was the result of purely selfish considerations, viz.: his desire for the peace and tranquillity of retirement. It must be conceded that the pomp and power of high station had little attraction for the Father of his Country. Personally, he doubtless preferred quiet and retirement, but he was always ready to sacrifice his own private interests to the public good; and there is ample evidence that in this act of his life, by which he renounced the greatness and power of his high position, his ideas of public duty entirely coincided with his private inclinations. He desired to retire at the end of his first term, and in anticipation of this event he wrote a letter to James Madison, dated May 20th, 1792, in which he expressed this wish and asked him to assist in the preparation of a suitable farewell address. The following is his language:

"I desire that you would turn your thoughts to a valedictory address from me to the public, expressing, in plain and modest terms, that having been honored with the presidential chair, and to the best of my abilities contributed to the organization and administration of the government; that having arrived at a period of life when the proper close of it in the shades of retirement becomes necessary and will be more pleasing to me (and as the spirit of the government may render a rotation in the elective offices of it more congenial to the ideas the people have of liberty and safety), that I take my leave of them as a public man," etc.*

In answer to this, Madison sent to Washington a draft of the proposed address, in which he endeavored to put the ideas of Washington, as conveyed to him orally as well as by the letter above referred to, in a clear and suitable form. In this draft we find the following language:

"May I be allowed further to add, as a consideration far more important, that an early example of rotation in an office of so high and delicate a nature, may equally concur with the republican spirit of our Constitution, and the ideas of liberty and safety entertained by the people.

Under these circumstances a return to my private station,

---

* *Vide* the entire letter in Sparks' *Life and Writings of George Washington*, Vol. XII, p. 382.

according to the purpose with which I quitted it, is the part which duty as well as inclination assigns me."*

It is true that this draft was never used, for the reason that Washington was prevailed upon to serve a second term. But it was retained by Washington. It concurs in spirit with the language used in his own letter to Madison. There is every reason to believe that it was fully approved by Washington. Near the close of his second term, when his farewell address was actually given to the public, this draft by Madison was sent by the president to Hamilton, that it might be recast and adapted to the changed circumstances then existing. It appears, therefore, that Washington was opposed to prolonging the presidential office beyond two terms. He thought that rotation in that office was in accordance with the spirit of the government and with popular ideas of liberty and safety.

As John Adams was only elected for one term, the question of a third term, of course, did not and could not arise with him. The next incumbent of the presidential office was Thomas Jefferson. He had originally been opposed to making a president reëligible at all. His views on this question, however, changed. In a letter to John Taylor, dated January 6th, 1801, after his second election but before the expiration of his first term, he says:

"My opinion originally was that the president of the United States should have been elected for seven years, and forever ineligible afterwards. I have since become sensible that seven years is too long to become irremovable, and that there should be a possible way of withdrawing a man in midway who is doing wrong. The service for eight years, with the power to remove at the end of the first four, comes nearly to my principle, as corrected by experience, and it is in adherence to that that I determine to withdraw at the end of my second term. The danger is that the indulgence and the attachments of the people will keep a man in the chair after he becomes a dotard; that reëlection through life, shall become habitual, and election for life follow that. General Washington set the example of voluntary retirement after eight years. I shall follow it, and a few more precedents will oppose the obstacle of habit to any one, after a while, who shall endeavor to extend his term. Perhaps it may beget a disposition to establish it by an amendment to the Constitution. I believe I am doing right, therefore, in pursuing my principle. I had determined

* Sparks' *Life and Writings of George Washington*, Vol. XII, p. 338.

to declare my intention, but I have consented to be silent on the opinion of friends, who think it best not to put a continuance out of my power, in defiance of all circumstances. There is, however, but one circumstance which could engage my acquiescence in another election, *i. e.*, such a division about a successor as might bring in a monarchist. But that circumstance is impossible. While, therefore, I shall make no formal declaration to the public of my purpose, I have freely let it be understood in private conversation. In this I am persuaded, yourself and my friends generally will approve of my views." *

Again, upon the expiration of his second term, Jefferson was solicited to consent to a continuance in office. This was asked for by the legislatures of various States. His answer was as follows:

"That I should lay down my charge at the proper period is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the chief magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by practice, his office, nominally for four years, will, in fact, become for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance. Believing that a representative government, responsible at short periods by election, is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the person, who, disregarding sound precedent, set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the *first* example of prolongation beyond the second term of office."

Jefferson's second term expired with the year 1808. In 1812, after a retirement of four years, he was again solicited to permit himself to be elected president. But he did not consider the four years' interregnum as affecting in any way the anti-third term principle which he had avowed, and he again peremptorily declined; and although his party continued in power up to the time of his death, no further attempt was made to restore him to the great position which duty had led him finally to resign eighteen years before he died. His successors—Madison and Monroe—each served for two terms, and each retired when the second term ended, not asking nor permitting their friends to ask for another nomination, during the many years of their subsequent retirement.

In 1828 Andrew Jackson was elected, as the nominee of the

* *Vide* Randall's *Life of Jefferson*, Vol. III, p. 132.

modern democratic party, and was reëlected in 1832. He was the idol of his party—a great military leader and popular favorite. But at the ending of his eight years' service, he voluntarily retired to the peaceful shades of the Hermitage, where he remained an interested observer of the history and progress of his country, but not a candidate, active or passive, for a reelection, neither asking nor suffering his friends to ask the people again to put him in the foremost place of power and honor, until his death in 1845. Since his administration, Gen. Grant is the only president who has served two entire terms.

From 1812 to 1875 there was no suggestion that any president should be reëlected after his second term.

In 1875 it was apparent that some of the friends of Gen. Grant desired to secure his election for a third term. When this disposition became manifest, it is not surprising, in view of the historical facts above detailed, that there was a very general uprising against such an attempt. The attention of republican State conventions in that year was called to this question, and almost without exception they adopted resolutions expressing their disapproval of the movement. As early as May, the Pennsylvania republican convention announced as the sentiment of the republicans of that State:

"That we declare and affirm unqualified adherence to the unwritten law of the republic, which wisely, and under the sanction of the most venerable of examples, limits the presidential service of any citizen to two terms; and we, the republicans of Pennsylvania, in recognition of this law, are unalterably opposed to the election to the presidency of any person for a third term."

The republican convention of the State of New York assembled in September, 1875. Among its resolutions, adopted by an overwhelming vote, was the following:

"Recognizing as conclusive the president's public declaration that he is not a candidate for renomination, and with the sincerest gratitude for his patriotic services, we declare our unalterable opposition to the election of any president for a third term."

State after State followed these examples; and on the 15th day of December, 1875, on motion of Mr. Springer, of Illinois, the rules were suspended and the following resolution

was passed, by the House of Representatives, by a vote of 233 to 18:

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this House the precedent established by Washington and other presidents of the United States, in retiring from the presidential office after their second term, has become by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise and fraught with peril to our free institutions."

The third-term movement subsided, and Gen. Grant's name was not presented to the republican National Convention in 1876. But the scheme was not given up. Its promoters were persevering and cunning. They resolved that, although they could not carry out their plan in 1876, they would only defer and not abandon it. Taking advantage of Gen. Grant's voyage around the world, of the cordial manner in which he was welcomed and entertained by kings and rulers in Europe and Asia, and of the enthusiasm which was naturally aroused by his return home early in the present year, they started what, in the slang language of the day, is termed a third-term "boom," fancying that all the circumstances which have been mentioned, and others which tended to favor it, would make it irresistible and successful, notwithstanding the general public sentiment on the subject.

The arguments used to promote this scheme and to overcome the popular feeling against a third term, were various and not altogether consistent. The friends of the Grant movement claim: 1. That the sentiment against a third term is unfounded in reason or principle; 2. That if it has any foundation it applies only to the *continuance* of a president in office for more than two terms, and has no application as an objection to the reëlection of a president after an interregnum of four years; 3. That, even assuming the soundness of the objection to three terms as a general rule, and conceding its applicability to any election to the presidency of a person who has served two terms, there is a special emergency at this time outweighing these objections and requiring the nomination and election of Gen. Grant. In support of these views, three articles have appeared in the pages of the *North American*

Review which it is perhaps fair to consider as presenting the various grounds upon which Gen. Grant's reëlection is advocated. These articles appeared, one in February written by Hon. Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin, one in March, by Hon. E. W. Stoughton, of New York, and one in the April number, by Hon. Geo. S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts. Let us take them up in their order:

Mr. Howe's article deserves little comment or attention. Palpable falsification of history, foolish vituperation and fulsome flattery, garnished with choice bits of Scripture, are mingled in about equal proportions in this most discreditable essay. The settled convictions of the people are called by him "senseless clamor." The almost unanimous views of the House of Representatives are termed "a champion piece of charlatanry." The general apprehension of danger to free institutions from a long continuance of the presidential office, is spoken of as a "soft spook,"—whatever that may mean. Those who are opposed to a third term are said to be "seduced from the worship of God to that of mere metallic calves." Mr. Howe states that the only criticism upon reëligibility made in the convention of New York, which ratified the United States Constitution, was made by Mr. Melancthon Smith, and that he found no one to second his idea in that body; in the face of the fact that that convention unanimously proposed an amendment, that no person should be eligible for a third presidential term. He states that not even in North Carolina was a man to be found to object to the reëligibility of the president, although in fact one of the amendments proposed by that State was, "That no person should be capable of serving as president more than eight in any term of sixteen years." He, by implication, charges Washington with cowardice, and gives as a reason for his retirement at the end of his second term, that he could not bear the gibes of his enemies, before which Grant never quailed. But his most atrocious calumny relates to Jefferson. Ignoring the fact that his views upon the subject of a third term were well known before his second term commenced, Mr. Howe directly charges that Jefferson's only reason for declining a third term was that he

could not get it; and accuses him of duplicity and deceit in giving expression to his views, as he did, in reply to the legislatures of Vermont and other States, which had desired him to become a candidate. He asserts in the face of the evidence of history that the republican States of Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia had "positively refused to join in the Jefferson boom," before his declension was announced. The only evidence which he gives of this assertion is the fact that the legislatures of these States, at that time, more than a year before the expiration of Jefferson's second term, had not acted upon the subject. But in fact, not one of them had expressed itself as against Jefferson. The "positive refusal" is a pure invention of Mr. Howe. Madison was Jefferson's secretary of State, and intimate political and personal friend. There was never any rivalry or hostility between them. Jefferson was the founder and the leader and idol of the republican party. At his second election he had received one hundred and sixty-two of the one hundred and seventy-six votes cast—the only States voting against him being Connecticut and Delaware. The other States all voted unanimously for Jefferson, except Maryland which gave him nine of her eleven votes. At the close of his second term he was equally popular with his party; and no student of history, except Mr. Howe, has ever pretended that he could not have received a third nomination if he had sought to obtain it, or would have accepted it.

Finding it necessary, in order to carry out the line of argument which he had adopted, Mr. Howe does not scruple to make Washington a coward and Jefferson a liar. He calls Gen. Grant "the foremost man of his age standing upon the mountain-top, upon whom the eager world has set the seal of primacy." He says "the world will make a mistake, if it shall turn from Jesus of Nazareth to follow Mr. Springer of Illinois," closing his remarkable diatribe with the following peroration: "Paul taught the Hebrews that without sacrifice there was no remission of sins. Americans are taught that not even sacrifice will save a president from rebuke after eight years service, although he has been sinless." Precisely what is

meant by this last language it is quite difficult to judge. We doubt if even Gen. Grant himself would claim to be "sinless;" although Mr. Howe found an apt disciple in an enthusiastic member of the late Utica Convention, who proclaimed this "sinless" man "standing on the mountain top," as the "God of battles!"

It is evident that Mr. Howe in his Scripture researches had overlooked the warning given by Paul to his sainted namesake: "O, Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings." Charity might lead us to account for this astonishing exhibition by the surmise that he had made too personal an application of that other passage, in which Timothy is enjoined by Paul to "drink no longer water." For it would be humiliating to believe that a man capable of writing such stuff in his sober moments, ever occupied the high position of Senator of the United States, and confidential adviser of the president. No opponent of a third term could desire any more effective means of cultivating the anti-third-term sentiment, than the general circulation of Mr. Howe's extraordinary article.

Mr. Stoughton's article is in a different spirit. It is not chargeable with the folly or the falsity of Mr. Howe's production.

Mr. Stoughton admits that there are doubtless worthy republicans who are opposed to the third term, and kindly says that he shall not sneer at nor ridicule such superstition, for the reason that he has known few men of strength of character or capacity, who did not nurse one of some kind. And he compares the opposition to a third term to the superstitions which influence some men to expect bad luck from seeing the new moon over the left shoulder, or to refuse to start a new enterprise on Friday.

All opponents of the third-term movement must feel exceedingly grateful to Mr. Stoughton for his great amiability in letting them off so easily. When we come, however, to look at his arguments, we are not impressed with their strength. In alluding to the example of Washington, he says that his declension was upon purely personal grounds, and

not from motives of public policy. We have already shown in this article that this is a mistake, and that Washington retired at the end of his second term because, in his view, public policy, as well as his own personal inclinations, required the step. Mr. Stoughton thinks that the only substantial objection to the enjoyment of consecutive presidential terms by the same person, is that a president desiring a renomination might corruptly and wickedly use the power and influence of his great office to obtain it; and finally perpetuate his rule by methods hostile to the Constitution and destructive of his country's liberties.

If that is the only objection to a third term, then it must be conceded that there is some force in his argument. But Mr. Stoughton is mistaken in saying that the only valid objection to a third term consists in the assumption that by his influence as president he may perpetuate his rule by renominations, as will be shown as we proceed. Perhaps it is not strange that the ex-minister to St. Petersburgh, said to be an ardent admirer of that "paternal government" which has produced such happy results in Russia, should on his return become distinguished as an advocate of third-termism for America.

Mr. Boutwell puts his argument upon a somewhat different basis from either Mr. Howe or Mr. Stoughton. He concedes that the examples of Washington and Jefferson and the traditions of the fathers are against a third term. But, he says, the opinions of Washington and Jefferson are entitled to the highest consideration as opinions, and nothing more. He insists that there is a question now demanding attention of greater importance than the ancient tradition against a third term, viz.: "Shall this government be destroyed or subverted permanently by the usurpation of the minority?" And he argues that the only sure way of answering this question in the negative is by the nomination and election of Gen. Grant. If Mr. Boutwell is right in his premises, we must concede that he is right in his conclusion. If the destruction and subversion of our government can only be prevented by the election of Gen. Grant, we should all yield our objections to a third term, and unite in his support. But we must remember

that Mr. Boutwell, as he is good enough to remind us in his article, occupied a place in Gen. Grant's cabinet. He, no doubt, estimates the Grant administration quite as highly as its merits permit. His opinion is valuable simply as Mr. Boutwell's opinion, and people must judge for themselves whether there is any such emergency as Mr. Boutwell says; and if there is, whether the best way to meet it is by Grant's renomination. By most sensible men the emergency will be believed to exist only in the imaginations of Mr. Boutwell and other office-holders under Gen. Grant; and the remedy proposed by him will be considered quite inappropriate for the imagined peril.

To one assertion of Mr. Boutwell we desire to interpose an emphatic denial. He says: "The republicans of the State of New York, appreciating the solemnity of the crisis and the importance of their position, have declared their purpose to support Gen. Grant for the presidency." The republicans of the State of New York have done no such thing. For the purpose of forestalling public opinion, the State convention was called in that State, as in Pennsylvania, in February, to elect delegates to the National Convention to be held in June. There could have been but one object for such an unseasonable call, and that object was not to secure a deliberate expression of the will of the republicans of New York, but to prevent and defeat such expression. The very fact that the convention was called in February deprives it of all authority as indicating the "sober second thought" of New York republicans. What honest reason can be given for calling a State convention in February to select delegates to attend a National Convention in June? Are arguments and discussions of any value? If so, why not let such arguments and discussions be continued until the necessary time for decision arrives? But the New York convention was not only called with fraudulent intent — it was fraudulently constituted. Grant delegates to this convention from Albany were elected by a fraud so gross and palpable, that no respectable republican newspaper in the State could be found to defend it. Delegates of the same character from Utica,

who were declared elected in violation of every rule of parliamentary law, were admitted to the floor of the convention. The same is said to be true of delegates from Brooklyn and from Buffalo. And in a convention so called and so packed, a resolution was passed by a bare majority of thirty-seven, favoring the nomination of Gen. Grant! Not the republicans of New York, Mr. Boutwell, but the wire-pullers and the machine-managers of New York, have declared their purpose to support Gen. Grant for the presidency! The rank and file of the party, as you call them, in New York, have never expressed themselves in favor of Gen. Grant. Nor, if we may believe the evidence already obtained and constantly accumulating, it is true of the republicans of Pennsylvania. No fair expression favorable to Grant's nomination has yet been had from any State in the Union.

Having thus reviewed briefly the arguments of these three champions of a third term, let us consider the subject somewhat upon its merits.

The example of the fathers and the traditions of our history are all opposed to a third term. Are these examples and traditions entirely without foundation in reason? It is assumed by those who insist that the anti-third-term doctrine has no application to the present attempt to renominate Gen. Grant, that the only ground upon which indefinite reëligibility has been opposed, is that it enables a president, by the use of his patronage and power, to secure his own reëlection. But it will be seen by reference to the expressions of Jefferson, already quoted, that that is not the only objection made by him to such indefinite reëligibility. He says the danger is from the indulgence and attachments of the people, as well as from the undue influence of the president. It is not pretended that there is any special magic in the period of eight years. It was a favorite doctrine of the Henry Clay whigs, that no person should be elected president for more than one term. But the great point is, that there should be some limit to prevent it from becoming a life office; and example and republican tradition have fixed that limit at two terms. It is essential to republican government that there should be no distinctively

reigning class. When a person has served eight years as President of the United States, his retirement into private life and becoming a private citizen and nothing more is the highest testimonial to the solidity of republican institutions.

An ex-president is, and should be, nothing more than any other citizen; nay, in one sense he should be less, for it should be understood that, having possessed that high honor for a term of eight years, he is no longer an aspirant for the position. A president who has had for eight years the patronage and power of that great office, especially when he has been Lieutenant-General and had intimate relations with the entire army, as well as the great corps of office-holders, is not, in the course of four years, so entirely divested of this advantage that he cannot avail himself of the influence and power thus acquired to promote his reëlection. Especially is this the case with Gen. Grant. He has not, in the ordinary sense of the term, become a private citizen since the expiration of his eight years. During all this time he has been conspicuously before the public eye, as the honored guest of the various nations of the world. All the influence of the general Government has been exerted to give him public prominence. A Grant newspaper organ has said that he is now "fresh from the people." But from what people is he fresh? He has certainly had little to do with Americans since his term expired. Is it believed that his association with the Chinese, Japanese and Siamese, or with the rulers of Europe, has impressed upon him the habits and duties of an American citizen? And while he has been travelling about the world, the men whom he placed in office have, as a rule, remained in office. The peculiar civil service theories of the present administration have led to the retention in office of the great body of the office-holders appointed by him—the men who ran the political machinery in most of the States. The party organization is still mainly in the hands of those who controlled it during his second term. Practically nearly all the objections to a third term exist now, which existed in 1876.

What is the supposed emergency urged as a reason for departing from established usages? and, if it exists,

how will Gen. Grant's reëlection meet it? Some say that Gen. Grant is the only republican who can be elected. On the contrary, it seems evident that no republican can be nominated, against whom such strong objections can be made, and who is so certain to fail of the support of a large portion of the party, as he. It is said that no other man, if elected, can be inaugurated. If this is true, then it is useless to try to nominate and elect Gen. Grant. If this is so, we may as well abandon the republican form of government at once and accept the least objectionable despotism that can be obtained. But it is not so. The will of the people, expressed by constitutional methods, will be enforced. And it matters not who is the standard-bearer. For whoever is declared elected through the mode known to the Constitution and the laws of the land, will certainly be inaugurated as president on the fourth day of March, 1881. If this argument in favor of Gen. Grant means anything, it means that he will not allow himself to be declared defeated; that he will decide in favor of his own election, and no other decision shall prevail. Are the third-term advocates prepared to sanction this construction of their favorite assertion?

There are very grave reasons why vast numbers of republicans believe that Gen. Grant should not be nominated. In doing this, they do not "rebuke" him, nor do they in any way derogate from his claims upon the gratitude of his country. That he sacrificed any more for his country than did many others, cannot be maintained. His fortunes were at a low ebb when the war commenced. During the war he did his duty like hundreds of thousands of others. To vast numbers of these, this discharge of duty brought death, or wounds, loss of fortune and loss of health. To Gen. Grant it brought glory, riches and power. For his efforts, his skill, his perseverance, his ability as a general, he has received rewards such as have never been conferred by this country upon any other citizen. The American people are not to be charged with ingratitude, because they withhold from him an honor which was not conferred upon Washington or Jefferson; an honor the bestowal of which the majority of the American people have ever believed to be incompatible

with the safety of free institutions. And it must be remembered also that while the American people honor Gen. Grant for his military services, there is by no means the same unanimity with reference to his merits as President of the United States. Criticism of his administration is not confined, as Mr. Stoughton in his article implies, to rebels and democrats; nor will opposition to his election, if nominated for a third term, be so confined. To the scandals of his second administration it is unnecessary to do more than to allude. The mention of the names of Leet and Stocking, Belknap and Babcock will suffice. It is not necessary, nor would it be just, to charge Gen. Grant with complicity with the corruptions that prevailed from 1872 to 1876. But they did prevail. They pervaded the men who were nearest to him. A peculiarity of Gen. Grant's character is, that he can see nothing wrong in those whom he deems his friends. It cannot be forgotten that Gen. Grant signed the law, which not only allowed members of Congress their notorious "salary grab," but also doubled his own salary. Nor can it be forgotten that when Gen. Babcock was on trial in St. Louis, Gen. Grant, by an act the most arbitrary and unjustifiable that was ever performed by the elected ruler of a free people, peremptorily removed, during the trial, the counsel who was conducting the case for the Government with marked skill and vigor, for the alleged reason that he had made a remark which was construed as derogatory to Gen. Grant, personally. For this constructive disrespect, denied by Mr. Henderson, he was thus removed. The acquittal of Gen. Babcock followed, and followed, as many believe, as the result of this most unwarrantable interference by the president. This is mentioned as only one instance showing Gen. Grant's frequent utter disregard of republican principles. He was never trained in civil life. He was never taught to respect constitutional rights. His ideas of government are purely military. He did, and if reëlected will again, administer the government of this country just as he would govern an army.

The same corrupt men who formerly gathered about him will again surround him, if he shall be reëlected. This is shown by the accounts given by his friend, John Russell

Young, of his conversations during his voyage around the world. There was in Gen. Grant's cabinet certainly one man who was earnest and vigorous in the prosecution of offenders. That was Benjamin H. Bristow. By such earnestness and vigor he won the approval and applause of great numbers of his countrymen. His candidacy for the presidency was favored by many good and patriotic republicans. But we are told that Gen. Grant said in one of his later conversations (and these conversations have been published with his approval), that he would have supported for the presidency any candidate who might have been nominated by the Cincinnati convention except Mr. Bristow, whom he would never have supported.* Why was it that Gen. Grant resolved that he would not support Gen. Bristow, if nominated? Can any reason be given, except that Gen. Bristow was an independent and efficient officer, and that in the vigor with which he prosecuted offenders against the law, he did not spare those who were connected with the president's military household, thereby incurring the president's displeasure? Gen. Bristow was a republican. Gen. Bristow's whole offence was that he had impartially and vigorously done his duty.

Argument in favor of Gen. Grant for a third term, based upon the idea that a "strong man" is needed, is dangerous and antagonistic to the whole spirit of our institutions. We want no strong man, if by that is meant one stronger than the Constitution and the laws. We want no man strong enough to disregard constitutional obligations! And we have in this country and in the republican party no lack of men who are strong enough to enforce the Constitution and the laws. The idea that Gen. Grant is the only man who can execute the laws of this country is a slavish and an anti-republican idea:

> "When went there by an age, since the great flood,
> But it was famed with more than with one man?
> When could they say till now, that talked of Rome,
> That her wide walls encompassed but one man?"

The arguments in favor of a third term and against the examples and instructions of the fathers on the subject, are all

---

* Vide *Around the World with Gen. Grant*, p. 273.

based upon distrust of popular institutions. The aim of true patriots should be to cultivate the opposite sentiment—faith in republicanism, faith in the Constitution, faith in the intelligence and patriotism of the American people. This can be best done in the present emergency by discarding the one-man, third-term idea, and adhering to the teachings of our forefathers; heeding the warnings of history, and preserving our liberties and our republican form of government by discouraging the theory that any one man is necessary to the prosperity and permanency of the republic.

It is with reluctance that the believers in the doctrine of Washington and Jefferson which holds a third presidential term to be of evil tendency, have felt themselves constrained to speak disparagingly of Gen. Grant's civil administration. They have no disposition to detract in any respect from his fame. They are as ready as any to express their admiration for all that is admirable in his character and distinguished in his achievements. But when thinking men are asked to depart from the usages of the republic and disregard the example of the wise and good men who secured our independence, they are compelled to examine carefully the claim presented; and if they see reasons against such departure, to declare them frankly and boldly. On the one side they see the example and the teaching of Washington and Jefferson, Madison, Monroe and Jackson, the declared conviction of the New York convention which ratified the Federal Constitution, the expressions of the republican State conventions of 1875, and the almost unanimous resolution of the House of Representatives of that year. On the other they find the opinions of Messrs. Stoughton, Boutwell and Howe, Senators Cameron and Conkling, the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the premature and packed conventions of Pennsylvania and New York of February, 1880.

If the latter authorities are clearly right, let us follow them, even where the reverend gentleman would lead, to fourth, fifth and an indefinite number of terms. But if the reason and the principle of the matter are with the dead presidents; if the doctrine of the founders of the republic tends more surely to

the preservation of the republic, let us adhere to it, even though the new lights be disregarded. The maxim *via antiqua, via tuta*, may not be of universal application, but it is worthy of some respect. There are doubtless inconveniences resulting from the frequent changes incident to a "government of the people by the people and for the people." But unless we are prepared to admit that such a government "must perish forever from the earth," let us hold fast to the traditions of a free people, and bear the ills we have, rather than fly to others that we know not of.

MATTHEW HALE.

Reprinted from the NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW,
for April, 1880.—Copyright.

The Republic and the Presidency.

To the student of political ethics, numerous and what would appear radical defects will be found to exist in the Constitution of the American Union—defects which, failing of remedy through amendment, as provided by the instrument itself, can scarcely fail in time to beget revolution. In the original cast of the instrument, no feature stands out more prominently than the one of manifest jealousy among the States associated in the original compact.

At the time of its formation much disparity existed in the status of the several States. Virginia and Massachusetts led the van in the struggle for independence. Both were powerful and populous, yet yielded to a remarkable degree their preponderance in the councils of the Union in deference to the demands of States like South Carolina, thus early nurturing the seeds of nullification. The only genuine democrat representing the section dominated over by the "cavaliers," and having an active voice in the formation of the Constitution, was Thomas Jefferson, always considered the father of American democracy. As regards territory embraced within the limits of the original thirteen States lying south of what has since been known as Mason and Dixon's line, the shadow of feudal despotism was early seen and increasingly developed, growing with the growth and strengthening with the strength of its slave basis, till the "Mother of Presidents" had become the nursery of feudalism and the hot-bed of despotism. It was left to the tory State of South Carolina to become the parent of disunion, and to the grand old commonwealth of Virginia so far to degenerate, as to develop at the outbreak of the rebellion a single case only of adhesion to Jeffersonian democracy, namely, that of John M. Botts, living a whig, and dying a true democrat.

It was in rock-bound and rugged New England, that the spirit of commonalty, unfettered by feudal influences, took deep and firm rooting; and we owe it to New England today that an enlightened federalism has developed into an intelligent democracy.

To govern States as individuals are governed was the early ambition of the statesmen of the South. To combine statesmen and States in the government of the Union, came to be the perfection of southern state-craft. That statesmanship such as this should have culminated in nullification, need not be wondered at. The local despot or petty tyrant in American democracy, or so-called republicanism, the mere schemer, not to say conspirator, seeking personal advantage at any sacrifice of political integrity, is, so far from being worthy of popular support, the man most to be shunned as an enemy to the republic. The republic, indeed, has existed hitherto only in name. That it survived sedition and civil war is a marvel, but not so much a marvel as would be its triumph over the influences now seeking to control it.

The result of feudalism within the Constitution, as well as of its development in political methods, produced a very great strain upon our political structure in 1876, when a disputed title to the presidency turned on a single electoral vote, and upon an adjudication outside of, and unknown to, the Constitution. It is a question by no means easy to answer, if the republic could endure another such experience. Feudalism, so far from disappearing, was never more powerful than it is today in the south. Even in New York, Pennsylvania and Illinois it has strong hold, and seems preparing for a death grapple with forces resolved on realizing a true republic. Everywhere the people are demanding free, honest and peaceful elections, an honest count, and an honest declaration of results.

So powerful are the influences at work in this direction, that the politicians are yielding to the inevitable, and generally agree that such realizations are as desirable as necessary. But the feudal chiefs of States and territories are giving evidence of having fallen back into their intrenchments, when they

grapple with the source of political power. Caucus and convention methods, the machinery of conclave and committee, not to say the machinations of conspirators, are the most powerful agencies of both the democratic and republican parties. So reckless of consequences have some of these chiefs and their clansmen become, that they seem to care little for the repute of their parties, and still less for the interest and good name of their country.

It is no part of the purpose of this article to point out or call by name the men determined to maintain personal domination, or take their chances in the ruins of the republic. That some of these believe they are not made of common clay or cast in the common mould, but were born to rule, and that the ordinary citizen should leave to them and their political subjects and dependents the nomination of all candidates for office, it is charitable at least to presume. That they are, however, sowing the wind only to reap the whirlwind is certainly true. Included within their folds of political brigandage are hundreds and thousands, bound to them by ties of interest, who are loyal to their masters and chiefs so long as the commissary is well supplied. To feed an hundred thousand retainers in a country as great as this is comparatively an easy matter. Should the commissary become exhausted, however, or the consumers multiply, they might become troublesome to those to whom they look for sustenance.

In the midst of all, the American people are rapidly finding out that the game as played by parties and politicians is one of method and madness combined, as devoid of patriotism and conscience as was ever one of cards or faro; and that when it comes to individuals aspiring in certain instances to the most eminent positions in the so-called republic, the one who can command the largest resources of men and money is the one most likely, as a rule, to succeed in his designs.

This unprecedented condition of things, applicable to both the republican and democratic parties, makes it difficult to calculate, with any degree of assurance, what is likely to be the result at Chicago and Cincinnati. The National Convention of the republicans will be held in the former city on

the 2d of June next. Seventeen days later, on the 19th of the same month, the democratic convention will assemble at Cincinnati. That either the one or the other of these conventions will be able to meet, deliberate and make nominations without sessions of unprecedented length, would scarcely seem possible.

Much is heard about instructions by State conventions and the enforcement of unit rules. It is fundamental that, in all delegated conventions, each delegate shall have the right to cast his vote on all questions which may be considered, untrammelled by any instructions outside of the convention. He will, of course, be held morally accountable to his constituency, should he misrepresent them on the main question which he was chosen to represent. He has the right to have his name called in open convention, and his vote recorded. In this way only can he be held accountable, and the record be made.

In the approaching National Republican Convention, the question whether the vote shall be cast by States or by individuals will probably be decided at the outset, as also whether delegates chosen by district conventions shall be admitted, instead of delegates chosen by State conventions. The true position should, therefore, be understood in advance. A congressional district is the unit of representation for so much of the convention as corresponds with the organization of the House of Representatives, and the State as compared with the United States Senate. Even these delegates, when more than one represents a State or district, are not bound to act together. Where two or four are chosen, one cannot act without the authority of the convention nor cast the votes of absentees.

The calling of two separate conventions by the democracy in New York, and the probable choice of two complete sets of delegates to Cincinnati, will only be supplemental to republican proceedings already under way in Pennsylvania, where, repudiating the action of the Cameron convention of February, the ides of March are barely passed before the incensed masses of the party proceed by districts to make choice of new sets of delegates, doing so on what is termed the Crawford county

plan. It is, therefore, more than probable that two full sets of delegates from Pennsylvania will present themselves for admission to seats in the Chicago convention. Nor is contest probably to end here. New York is also likely, as regards several, if not all, of her districts, to make choice of new sets of delegates.

By the admission of the Smyth delegation from Albany, the rejection of the Reeve delegation from Brooklyn, and the admission of persons having no claim at all to seats at Utica—to say nothing of the thousand and one other reasons for complaint touching the conduct of committees, caucuses, local and general conventions, causing the selection of a delegation, not as representatives of the party, but of individual leaders—the Utica delegation is left without support, other than the empty one of regularity. Should a contesting delegation, representing the majority of the party, and chosen by districts, present itself claiming seats at Chicago, the chances of each for admission would seem to be equal. What is true of Pennsylvania and New York may, and not unlikely will, occur in other States; and thus, at both Chicago and Cincinnati, contests without number, giving rise to delay and bad feeling, would seem to be inevitable.

This condition of things cannot fail to place each of the candidates most prominently mentioned in such a position as to make the nomination of either on first ballot altogether improbable.

Of ex-President Grant—up to the present, as regards the press, invariably first mentioned—this must prove impressively true. America's most widely famed hero has, despite all predictions to the contrary, allowed his friends to go forward and make him a candidate for a third term of the presidency. There are, probably, a full million of republicans, who, when he landed at San Francisco on return from his journey around the world, would have denied him no honor short of a crown, that sit soberly today questioning whether he is worthy of any honor at all. These are the men who disbelieved, at the outset, the statement that Gen. Grant was to come again before the people as a presidential candidate. They believed that his

fame as a soldier would make him unwilling to take the risk of entering the field as a candidate for a third term. From the distant Orient came the intelligence that Gen. Grant had said in substance that under no circumstances would he again accept the presidency. Landing at San Francisco, and continuing his triumphal journey across his native land, amid salvos of artillery and the shouts of the multitude, his lips remained sealed, nor did he say a word or give a sign indicating aught than a fixed determination to adhere to this wise and patriotic resolution. Up to the time he reached Philadelphia everybody seemed his friend, nobody his enemy. Here it was, however, that he manifestly encouraged his favorites and friends to proceed with their work of once more making him President. Then it was, also, that the masses of honest, thoughtful and far-seeing republicans felt compelled to unite in an unyielding opposition to the establishment of a precedent so dangerous.

Meantime, the wise, peaceful, and successful administration of President Hayes, coupled with numberless acts of folly on the part of a democratic Congress, had not merely encouraged republicans to believe that they would easily succeed in the coming presidential contest, but had caused the friends of various prominent Americans to array themselves on the side of this or that aspirant for presidential honors.

John Sherman of Ohio, has, in the brief period of three years, as Secretary of the Treasury, done for American finances what has never before been accomplished in the history of his country. He has not only brought about resumption, but succeeded in funding a large proportion of a vast national debt, saving millions annually in interest, and greatly lightening the burdens of taxation. He has caused the revenues of the Government to be honestly and economically collected; nor has a defaulter been found or a scandal prevailed anywhere in his administration of the finances. It is said of him that he is cold, calculating, methodical, measured in all things and lacking in personal magnetism; and that, while nearly everybody wants him for Secretary of the Treasury, next to nobody desires to see him made President.

This, however, is a great mistake. While the masses of men are aroused by magnetism, there are large numbers of others, kings among men, born with the instincts and elements of success, who feel that the man who makes the most money, or, above all, enables themselves to make it, is the greatest of heroes. From the beginning of the world to the present, among princes and people alike, the measure of success has been counted in the accumulation of dollars and cents. It will not be so when the time comes that the republic is other than a myth,—developing itself as a fact, rather than a mere theory. Royalty in all ages has, as a rule, brought riches also. Empires, kingdoms, and republics as well, have had golden foundations.

So far from having reached the point where money-making has begun to surfeit, there has never been a period in the world's history when the love of gain more widely prevailed than at the present. It infects all classes, and the richest men of the world are the ones most eager and anxious to accumulate wealth. More riches have been added to the coffers of the people in America, since John Sherman became head of the Treasury, than in the same period of time, since the republic had a beginning. As regards his candidacy, his recent declaration to his neighbors in Ohio, that, unless the republicans of his own State prefer him, and make that preference manifest by standing by him in substantial unanimity, he will not suffer his name to be used, is evidence of the temper of the man. Conscious of his own merits, and enabled, as he is, to point back to a period of nearly thirty years of public life without spot or blemish, coupled with recent achievements wherein no man living or dead has been enabled to more completely demonstrate that the victories of peace are greater than those of war, he does only justice to himself, and honors manhood, by this last declaration.

Next in order is James G. Blaine, in whose very *personality* is a something akin to magic. That he is loved by tens of thousands and admired by millions of his countrymen, cannot be denied. It is impossible for political opponents to dislike, while it is equally impossible for his party friends to do other-

wise than cleave to him. No man probably lives, who knows so many men personally. His face is one of ever-beaming sunshine, and the grasp of his hand, when extended to a friend or an acquaintance, can never be forgotten. The writer's personal acquaintance with Mr. Blaine has fully convinced him that the senator has not only as great a mind, but as large a heart, as any man in America,—and teaches him to unite heartily with his countrymen in an effort to see the gallant senator from the Pine Tree State made chief magistrate of the nation. Whether it be during the year 1880, or four, or even eight years hence, it surely ought to be done as a something due to the instincts of the people, decreeing it as an event in the fitness of things.

It has been urged that Mr. Blaine, as a politician, has remarkable powers; and yet some assert that he does not possess statesmanship of the highest order. In reviewing Mr. Blaine's history, one point at least stands out in bold relief, evidencing his great power in controlling men, and managing delicate and complicated questions of State. The peaceful and just issue of the recent contest in Maine against one of the most audacious attempts ever made upon constitutional liberty, is certainly due largely to the wise, firm and skilful manner in which Mr. Blaine conducted the affair on behalf of the people.

As member of the popular branch of Congress, having devolved upon him committee responsibilities of the weightiest character, as a leader in parliamentary law, as Speaker of the House of Representatives,—the most prominent of his predecessors failed to exhibit more varied and successful qualities. Since taking seat in the Senate, all agree that the leadership lies between him and Senator Conkling; nor is the question yet determined to which of them that honor belongs.

In conclusion, if Mr. Blaine has not developed the highest order of statesmanship in every field of politics in which he has been called to act, it would be difficult to say who has done so. The aggregate conscience and intelligence of the American people can safely be trusted to determine the fitness of a man for the presidency. Taking this as a test, Mr.

Blaine's popularity would seem to give him an equal chance, in the present campaign, with Secretary Sherman.

There, too, are Messrs. Washburne, Edmunds, Evarts, Garfield, and Hayes, who would be candidates of eminent fitness, especially the latter. In a recent conversation with a newspaper reporter, President Hayes is represented as pointing to a dark horse somewhere, not unlikely to carry off the prize at Chicago; at the same time counting himself out as among possible candidates, and declaring his determination to adhere to the decision in his letter of acceptance, under no circumstances to be a candidate for reëlection. In view of one of those manifest defects in the Constitution, hinted at in the opening of this article—the absence of an express provision, providing for one term only, and making the incumbent ineligible to reëlection—the position taken by President Hayes will, we are quite sure, do much to give him a name and fame in the future of our country. Barely one thing, in the estimation of the writer of this article, in event of a dark horse being necessary, would be found in the way of Mr. Hayes' renomination at Chicago. His declination of a second term would go for nothing. He has not been too conciliatory or generous toward the south. His southern policy, so called, has proved a success. The calling of General Key to his cabinet, more bitterly complained of by the class of republicans denominated "Stalwarts" than any other act of his administration, has come to be regarded on all hands as one of eminent wisdom and foresight. The postmaster-general has developed into one of the most honored members of as able a cabinet as any since the foundation of the government. Not toward the south, then, or any portion of her people, has the president been too generous. It is toward the rancorous, bitter and malignant enemies of his administration in his own party at the north, notably in New York, that he has carried conciliation to a point where his real friends, who are, in fact, a majority in the State, have become disheartened, feeling that battling against machine methods is hopeless, and only to be paid for by political penalties too grievous to be borne. With all this, the possibilities sur-

rounding the necessities of a dark horse may even yet force President Hayes into the list of candidates to be voted for at Chicago.

Washburne and Edmunds are, equally with Conkling, Cameron and Logan, reckoned as friends of Gen. Grant; but whether this calculation is true as regards Senator Edmunds, would seem doubtful in view of the fact that he is strongly pressed by reform elements in the party. In any event, no recognized partisan or friend of the ex-president is nearly as strong as Gen. Grant himself; and if he cannot himself be nominated, surely none of his friends will be suffered by the anti-Grant element in the party to receive the nomination. No mention has been made of Hamilton Fish, whose name has perhaps more generally been mentioned than that of any other, in event of the nomination falling by accident to New York, for the reason that, to do so, would be to obscure mention of the names of others, quite as eminent and equally as liable to be nominated. William M. Evarts, Edwin D. Morgan, Reuben E. Fenton and William A. Wheeler have, equally with Governor Fish, their friends and admirers. As friends of the dead Seward, and as representatives of the principles governing American politics during the decade antedating the slave-holder's rebellion, Messrs. Morgan, Evarts and Wheeler hold rank quite as eminent as does Governor Fish: while Governor Fenton in turn represents the dead Greeley, and—though hesitating somewhat to speak and act out boldly his convictions, more eminently than any one else represents the advance guard of republicanism in its war upon feudal authority; in other words, the republicanism of the present, and the republic of the future. Governor Morgan could and would have been nominated at Cincinnati in 1876, had not the present executive of New York State, as the representative of Mr. Conkling, held out to the last against it, and, through influence with a majority of his associate delegates, prevented Mr. Morgan's nomination. Historical truth requires the statement that several of the delegates from New England, largely representing that section, outside of Maine, are understood to have waited on Mr. Cornell and persistently urged the

dropping of Mr. Conkling's name on the part of the New York delegation, and the agreement upon that of Gov. Morgan, coupled with the strongest assurance that, if this were done, nearly or quite all of the Bristow element, alike from Kentucky and Massachusetts—and the sections of the Union represented by the radicalism of the one, and the conservatism of the other, forming the golden mean of republicanism—would unite and make Gov. Morgan's nomination inevitable.

At the time of this dictation on the part of a self-constituted political satrap, holding seat in the National Convention not from authority on the part of the people, but through frauds as monstrous as those which gave the Smyth delegation from Albany seats in the recent convention at Utica—there is not a shadow of doubt that, could the question have been submitted to a vote of the republicans of the Empire State, whether the great war governor, Edwin D. Morgan, or the brilliant senator and feudal chief, Roscoe Conkling, should be made their standard-bearer, the verdict would have proven fully three for Morgan to one for Conkling. A net-work of correspondence, at that time existing, and more fully developed since in the organization of the "Republican Reform League," covering the entire State and reaching every school district, clearly demonstrates these assertions to be true. It is no disrespect to President Hayes to say, that had Gov. Morgan's name been thus agreed upon, in the election which followed he would doubtless have carried New York, and probably Indiana and New Jersey, and thus the question of the presidency would have been settled without the necessity of the Electoral Commission.

As regards Secretary Evarts,—such is the profundity of his legal abilities, the enlightenment of his views, his radicalism in all that pertains to the rights of man, his conservatism in all things political, that it is too much to hope or expect that he would be made the presidential choice of the elements mainly to appear at Chicago. As the American people have but the crudest conceptions of what is required to make a republic, so it is impressively true that delegations chosen as have been not only those of New York

and Pennsylvania, but of most of the other States thus far, are not the ones to bring forward such a man as Mr. Evarts for the presidency. The American premier, in short, represents rather the republic which is to be, than the one that is presumed to exist. With all this, the ways of Providence are past finding out, and nobody at this distance can foresee what may occur at Chicago. The American people, at least the reading and thinking portion of them, are just discovering that they are really represented nowhere,—the place-seekers, place-holders and schemers, everywhere.

The revolution manifestly begun and well under way in Pennsylvania, is liable to continue to spread, until the people, through their demands for a real republic, become the conquerors, and the politicians the vanquished. A call has been put in circulation, inviting anti-third-term republicans to a conference at Albany, on April 21st, at which time such action will be taken as may very probably beget a new republican State committee, provide for the holding of a new State convention, and the issuance of a call for congressional district conventions, to choose new delegates representing the masses rather than the "machine." The pressure of such a delegation at Chicago, finding itself perchance unable to agree on any of the candidates outside the State, and urging the nomination of Secretary Evarts, Governor Morgan, Governor Fenton, Governor Fish, Vice-President Wheeler, or some other eminent New Yorker, could scarcely fail of producing a sensation hitherto unknown in American politics—convincing the feudal chiefs, at least, that the day of their political dictation has passed away forever.

This brings us to the list of prominent candidates in the ranks of the democracy. First on such list stands the name of Samuel J. Tilden, one of the most remarkable men ever known to American history,—a man possessing the arts and devices of an Aaron Burr, the legal ability of an Evarts, the fertility in resource of Jay Gould, and, above all, those qualities so admired by Talleyrand, whose hero was the man who could make the best use of language to conceal his ideas. Perhaps no man ever lived who knew better how to make

the greed and ambitions of his fellow men to serve his purposes.

The writer of this article has been studying Mr. Tilden's character since the memorable epoch of 1848, nor has yet been able to make up judgment touching the impulses which have actuated, and the motives which have controlled his career. That Mr. Tilden not merely believes in democracy, but fancies himself its most eminent representative, charity, at least, would lead us to conclude. In fact, men have lived in all ages, not depraved or bad at heart, whose philosophy has nevertheless been that of the end justifying the means. There have been times when it would seem that Mr. Tilden, more eminently than any other American, represents this phase of political philosophy. That his ends have been laudable is not improbable; but that the means to which he has, as a rule, been in the habit of resorting, could scarcely have been worse, a large portion of the American people have come to believe. With all his great powers—those indeed of the magician in politics—his nomination at Cincinnati will be found barely among the possibilities. Upon this theory of possibilities, largely if not equally applying to Gen. Grant, should the result at Chicago and Cincinnati be such as to find the one pitted against the other, human discernment is incapable of an intelligent judgment as regards the result in November. Already, in nearly every State, the elements of both of the hitherto existing parties are combining—crystallizing rather—into forms likely to result in new conventions of the people, the outgrowth of which can hardly fail of complete revolution. Democracy and republicanism, indeed, would be most likely to disappear as hitherto existing, and the *vox populi, vox Dei*, heretofore so frequently quoted, would find realization in the inauguration—possibly before its day—of that republic which time is destined to bring to the American people.

Of other candidates spoken of by the democrats, Messrs. Seymour, Thurman, Bayard, Hancock, Hendricks, David Davis and others, so remote is the possibility of either being nominated, that nothing more than the mere mention of their names need be made.

Two names, and only two, have been mentioned, possessing in our judgment much weight as regards probabilities of nomination. Mr. Groesbeck of Ohio is perhaps the best specimen of Jeffersonian democracy among democrats of the present generation. In a recent interview, reported in the newspapers, it is stated that Mr. Groesbeck, when asked whether he would consent to accept the nomination, if tendered to him at Cincinnati, replied by saying that, while he was not a candidate for any office, if the representatives of the democratic party were to make him their choice, he certainly should not incline to that sort of disagreement which would forbid their doing so. And yet he would say or do nothing to seek the nomination. Mr. Groesbeck is confessedly a man of great abilities, eminently patriotic and conservative, and perhaps no man in the country would hold a more even hand than he as chief magistrate of the nation.

The other name is that of a gentleman possessing all the excellent qualities of Mr. Groesbeck, coupled with others giving him rank among the first men in the business and politics of the country. This is Hugh J. Jewett, President of the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railroad Company, in no sense a dark horse—as has sometimes been suggested—but one whose name, growing steadily, extends today into all parts of the civilized world. His achievements in taking hold of the affairs of what seemed the most rotten and hopeless railroad corporation on this continent, and bringing it into complete solvency, have fixed upon him the eyes of the money-kings of the old and the new worlds. Nor is John Sherman, chief of financial successes, as Secretary of the Treasury, better known to the world's financiers than is Hugh J. Jewett. A solitary objection has been urged against Mr. Jewett as a presidential candidate, viz.: that of his identification with one of the greatest railways of the world, and his consequent supposed removal from sympathy with the laboring classes. It only needs, however, a look beneath the surface, to discover that to Hugh J. Jewett are the employes and operatives connected with our vast system of railways more indebted than to any other, for those

enlightened and progressive methods of management which are lifting them to the highest plane, as regards the dignities and profits of labor so ennobling every class of workingmen.

Let no one presume that Mr. Jewett's name is other than that of the most formidable candidate yet mentioned in connection with the democratic nomination for the presidency. This it is, and thus is it regarded by the closest observers and most impartial judges of political probabilities, irrespective of party, throughout the country. Should he be nominated, which seems more than probable, and be found pitted against the ex-president, the friends of the latter, within a few weeks, at farthest, after the opening of the campaign, will be very likely to find themselves buried with their candidate beneath a political avalanche not yet so much as dreamed of by one in a thousand of even the more intelligent of American politicians. As opposed to John Sherman or James G. Blaine, who are now universally recognized as dividing between them the chances of receiving the nomination of the republican party, Mr. Jewett would alone, apparently, fail of success through want of confidence in the party behind him, rather than through distrust of its nominee. Under any and all circumstances, the States of New York, New Jersey, Indiana, and perhaps one or two others of the north, may be set down as in doubt, should Mr. Jewett be made the democratic candidate. His record is such, as regards loyalty to the Union, the Constitution as it was, and the Constitution as it is, coupled with his acknowledged abilities as one of the very ablest men of the country, and possessing statesmanship of the highest order, as to render him in every respect unassailable.

What manner of man, in fact, is the Hon. Hugh J. Jewett, may be learned from the following statements of Judge George F. Comstock of Syracuse:

"I know Hugh J. Jewett well, and the movement to nominate him for President at Cincinnati seems to be gaining considerable prominence and it is not unlikely that it may succeed. The delegates from Ohio will, of course, give Mr. Thurman a complimentary vote, and if it can be shown that Mr. Jewett can carry Ohio, they will then go for him and that will nominate him.

"Mr. Jewett is as honest a man as there is in the United States. He is a strong business man, and understands the wants and needs of the business men of the country thoroughly. He is safe on all subjects of finance and currency, and should he be nominated, I think no living man would get a stronger vote in the city of New York. Mr. Jewett has wonderful executive ability, and would call around him a cabinet composed of the very best men of the country. The resuscitation of the Erie Railway under the management of Mr. Jewett, was the greatest financial achievement this country has ever known. The business men of the country would have the utmost confidence in Mr. Jewett's administration, and the country would be perfectly safe under it. The character of the man is shown from the following anecdote: In 1861 he was nominated by the democrats for Governor of Ohio. He was a war democrat and would not accept the nomination on the platform laid down by the State convention, for the reason that it did not support the war. He wrote two letters to the State committee, one declining the nomination for Governor on the platform of the convention, and the other accepting it on a platform of his own, which he enclosed, and which gave a vigorous support to the war. He informed the State committee that it might do as it pleased with the letters. The committee accepted Mr. Jewett's and he ran largely ahead of his ticket. The democrats in my opinion could not nominate for President a better or a safer candidate or a more available one."

In conclusion, the presidential campaign of 1880 is destined, in any event, to prove a memorable one in the annals of American history. It will doubtless be the last involving the question whether the politicians or the people shall rule. The new census will bring not only a new south, but equally a new north, east and west, not to say a new Union, and, in due time, unless broken in the struggles and strifes of the present year, a new and permanent republic; which shall witness honest primaries, peaceful and honest elections, and at length, such amendments to the Constitution as the advancement and necessities of the nation require.

A. N. Cole.

☞ The First Series of the NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, comprising 68 numbers, can b had on application, at the office of publication. Price: in Paper, $1.00 per number, or $3.(per volume bound in half-turkey.

The following list comprises The Essays of the First Six Volumes of the Second Series:

SECOND SERIES, VOL. I, NO. I.—*July, 1877.*

I. The Seat of Rome and Civil Allegiance.
II. Natural and Supernatural.
III. German Novels and Novelists. Part I.
IV. The Sclavonic Races of Europe.
V. Past and Present of Life-insurance.
VI. The Travail of Democracy.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. I, NO. II.—*October, 1877.*

I. The Civil and Military Administration of General Ulysses S. Grant.
II. The Influence of Caste on Western Europe.
III. German Novels and Novelists. Part II.
IV. Oriental Christianity.
V. Harriet Martineau.
VI. Odd Customs in Old Families.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. II, NO. III.—*January, 1878.*

I. The National Interest and the Labor Question.
II. The Maecenas of Germany.
III. Philology and the Origin of Speech.
IV. The Progress of Modern Astronomy.
V. The Supernatural.
VI. The Sheridans—a Rare Literary Family.
VII. Rationale of the Death-Rate.
VIII. John Lothrop Motley.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. II, NO. IV.—*April, 1878.*

I. The Progress of Self-Government.
II. Pre-historic Man in America.
III. Art and Religion in Works of Fiction. Part I.
IV. The Alexandrian Museum.
V. Career of M. Thiers.
VI. Divine and Human Agency.
VII. Old Irish Books and Manuscripts.
VIII. Money and Currency

SECOND SERIES, VOL. III, NO. V.—*July, 1878.*

I. China and the Chinese.
II. The Ethics of Marriage and Divorce.
III. Art and Religion in Works of Fiction. Part II.
IV. Russia's Present Position in Europe.
V. The Lunar Theory.
VI. The Papacy of Pius IX.
VII. Evolution and Volition.
VIII. The Knights Templars.
IX. The Development of Art. Part I.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. III, NO. VI.—*October, 1878.*

I. Ethics of Civil Government. Part II.
II. The Relation of Science to Scholastic Philosophy.
III. Madame Dudevant.
IV. Condition and Prospects of the Southern States. Part I.
V. Education and the Religious Sentiment.
VI. Present Aspects of Socialism.
VII. Libraries, Ancient and Modern.
VIII. William Cullen Bryant.
IX. Triple View of *Divine and Human Agency.*

SECOND SERIES, VOL. IV, NO. VII.—*January, 1879.*

I. Ideal Commonwealths.
II. The Battle-field of England and Russia.
III. Matter, Life and Mind.
IV. War Indebtment: Its Limitations and Dangers.
V. Voltaire and the French Revolution.
VI. The Ecclesiastical Question in Italy.
VII. Condition and Prospects of the Southern Stat Part II.
VIII. The Development of Art. Part II.
IX. Alzog's Church History.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. IV, NO. VIII.—*April, 1879.*

I. Problems Physical and Metaphysical.
II. Jonathan Swift and His Times.
III. Temperance as a National Question.
IV. The Poetry of Atheism.
V. France: Her Ninety Years of Probation.
VI. The Elements of National Finance.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. V, NO. IX.—*July, 1879.*

I. The Relation of Physical States to Mental Derangement.
II. Prince Bismarck and German Unity.
III. The Nature-Sentiment in Poetry.
IV. The Present Phase of the Mormon Problem.
V. The Ratio of Capital to Consumption.
VI. The Development of Art.
VII. Pernicious Juvenile Literature.
VIII. The Doctrine of Perception.
IX. The Sutro Tunnel.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. V, NO. X.—*October, 1879.*

I. The Republic of Athens from Alcibiades to Demosthenes.
II. The Chinese Immigration Question.
III. The Rationale of Panics.
IV. William Makepeace Thackeray.
V. The Grain-Fields of Russia and America.
VI. The Ethics of Utilitarianism.
VII. The Development of Art.
VIII. Judge Jones' History of New York.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. VI, NO. XI.—*January, 1880.*

I. Rise and Fall of the Bonapartes.
II. The Management of the Indians.
III. The English Classics.
IV. The Hygiene of Water.
V. The Working-classes of Europe.
VI. The Nebular Hypothesis.
VII. Interstate Extradition.
VIII. The New Eastern Question.
IX. A Southerner's Estimate of the Life and Character of Stephen A. Douglas.

SECOND SERIES, VOL. VI, NO. XII.—*April, 1880.*

I. The Clerical Question in France.
II. Observations on the Physics and Metaphysics of Light.
III. Russia and Germany in the Event of a War.
IV. The Scottish Poets.
V. American Mines and Mining Interests.
VI. The Third-Term Question.
VII. The Railway Problem.
VIII. Politics—Railway Problems and Theorists.
IX. The Republic and the Presidency.

Address **THE NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW,**
13 & 15 Park Row, New York.

THE NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OPINION OF THE PRESS.

It is at once the most learned, most brilliant, and most attractive of all their (the American) periodicals.—*London Spectator.*

It certainly exhibits high culture and marked ability.—*London Saturday Review.*

More than a year ago we ranked it with the best of our own Quarterlies, and it certainly has not lagged since in ability or vigor.—*London Daily News.*

Il (the Editor) a mérité l'estime de nos savants par d'importants travaux comme critique sur la haute éducation, aussi bien que la littérature.—*Indépendance belge*, Brussels.

La clarté, l'ordre, la précision du style; ce que les Anglais appellent *humour*, et parfois l'ironie, sont les qualités qui distinguent la NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW au-dessus de tout autre journal littéraire américain.—*Le Pays*, Paris.

This REVIEW stands unrivalled in America for all that constitutes literary excellence.—*Canadian Post.*

It is altogether a valuable journal, breathing a cosmopolitan spirit, and shou'd receive encouragement in this province.—*Toronto Leader.*

Its articles are of the first order for vigor, comprehensiveness and ability.—*National Intelligencer.*

The most animated and vigorous of all our quarterlies, and will sustain a comparison with the best European publications of its class.—*Boston Traveller.*

This REVIEW certainly stands now at the head of American critical literature, and is so esteemed in Europe.—*Philadelphia Press.*

Its critical estimates of moral and literary merits and demerits are honest, clear, and almost always trustworthy.—*New York Independent.*

This work is well conducted, ably written, and more than all, interestingly useful. Every good citizen should desire to sustain it for its healthful, moral spirit.—*Philadelphia Inquirer.*

The ablest, most independent, most liberal and best adapted to popular progress among the American people, of all the Quarterlies published or re-published in the Union.—*Portland Advertiser.*

One of the most useful and valuable literary organs within reach of the American reader.—*Chicago Tribune*

Superior to any other secular magazine publication in America, and in no manner surpassed by any European Review.—*Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph.*

All lovers of solid literature and masterly criticism should possess it.—*Cleveland Christian Standard.*

It is a model of good taste and good sense, of sound judgment and pure diction, of earnest scholarship and patient research, of critical ability and enlarged liberality.—*Baltimore Underwriter.*

It combines great learning with vigor of style and fearless utterance.—*Boston Journal.*

This is the ablest Quarterly in the country. It is conservative, but not partisan, scholarly, but not pedantic, learned, and still practical.—*Portland Argus.*

We have been often struck with the sterling qualities of this periodical, which is an honor to our literature and a monument to our national reputation.—*Baltimore Catholic Mirror.*

Really great in literary worth. Its contributors rank among the most noted men of the age.—*Boston Traveller.*

A peculiarly able magazine—one that ranks equal with any ever published in the history of magazine publications.—*Washington Capital.*

The NATIONAL is indispensable to those who wish to be abreast of the times.—*Baptist Weekly.*

This is a periodical of the highest order. It surpasses most Quarterlies in the depth and reach of its investigations. Its elaborate articles on government, jurisprudence, and ethics, are among the ablest that find expression anywhere. A model of typographical beauty; its pages are book-like in dignity and grace; and its place in literature distinct and important.—*Methodist Recorder.*